

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-20 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1-20 are finally rejected by Examiner.
- Claims 5 and 12 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.
- Claims 1, 10 and 14 are amended by Applicant.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as indefinite with reference to the element “at least one external computer”. Applicant has amended Claims 10 and 14 to include the definite article “the” with the stated element. Applicant submits that the addition of the definite article “the” in association with the element of “at least one external computer” traverses the stated rejection.

Applicant has also amended Claims 1 and 10 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,538,880 to Kamijo et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,778,519 to Harrell et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Examiner states that Kamijo et al. teaches the laptop computer (110) as a docking station for receiving mobile computer (120) into port (1110). (Present Office Action, page 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees that a laptop computer is a docking station.

Kamijo et al. teaches a portable digital assistant (PDA) type of device or apparatus (120) that is expected to function as an input/output device to a notebook PC mainframe (110). (Col. 3 lines 34-39). Kamijo et al. teaches a new input/output apparatus that adds or complements the functions of PC mainframe when connected with PC mainframe, and

operates in the same manner as a conventional PDA when detached from the PC mainframe. (Abstract). The PDA-like apparatus (120) does not appear to remove the inherent, independent, general purpose processing ability of the PC mainframe (laptop).

Amended Claims 1 and 10 of the present invention recite (in relevant part) a docking station for a mobile computer that comprises a port for receiving a mobile computer, a communication interface for communicating with at least one external computer; and a display for depicting information exchanged across the communication interface. The docking station of the present invention does not have the built-in, general purpose, computing capability of the PC mainframe (120) or laptop of Kamijo et al. and is therefore distinguishable.

Kamijo et al., teaches that a PDA-like device may be coupled with a standard PC mainframe (120.) This effectively teaches away from the present invention because the docking station recited in amended Claims 1 and 10 do not have the general purpose computing capability of the Kamijo et al. PC (120).

Additionally, the Examiner states that Kamijo et al. fails to specifically teach the laptop docking station communicating with an additional external computer. (Present Office Action, page 3). Applicant agrees. However, Applicant does not agree that Harrell et al. teaches the elements of Claims 1 and 10 missing from Kamijo et al.

Harrell et al. teaches a wireless, multiple function PC card that uses spread spectrum communications to link a host computer to a variety of peripheral devices. (Abstract and Figure 2). Although Figure 2 of Harrell et al. depicts a "docking station", it is neither a receptacle for the insertion of a mobile computer nor a display for information from an external computer as recited in amended Claims 1 and 10.

Conceptually, Applicant notes that Harrell et al. teaches away from the present invention by stating:

The remote docking station supports multiple peripheral interfaces to multiple respective peripheral devices. The thin architecture PC Card received by a portable computer is preferably a PCMCIA card. Preferably, all of the peripheral devices are physically located at the remote docking station rather than at the computing apparatus.

Figure 2 of the present invention depicts that external computer peripherals are accessible via the external computer (230) when the mobile computer (220) is not installed

into the multipurpose docking station (210). This depiction is the opposite teaching of Harrell et al. which preferably locates peripherals on the docking station (60). Thus, the configuration of Harrell et al. teaches away from the present invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness per 35 U.S.C §103(a) (See MPEP 706.02(j)). Applicant notes that neither Kamijo et al. nor Harrell et al., either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the invention recited in Claims 1 and 10 because all elements are not present in the references. Additionally, as discussed above, each reference teaches away from the present invention and are therefore would not be rationally combined by one of skill in the art. Accordingly, the combination of Kamijo et al. and Harrell et al. cannot render obvious amended Claims 1 and 10. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 1 and 10 as these claims patentably define over the cited art.

Similarly, in as much as Claims 2-4 and 6-9 depend on amended Claim 1, and Claims 11 and 13-20 depend on amended Claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims also patentably define over the cited art for the reasons provided above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of dependent Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11 and 13-20.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1973/304061.1

Application No.: 10/621,286


Office Action Dated: 10/08/2004

PATENT

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is in a condition for allowance upon entry of the amendments herein. Applicants respectfully and earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Date: December 10, 2004



Jerome G. Schaefer
Registration No. 50,800

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439